



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,669	08/27/2001	Jens Petersen	60117.000004	2508

7590 03/01/2006
Stanislaus Aksman
Hunton & Williams
Suite 1200
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

AZPURU, CARLOS A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1615

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/938,669	Applicant(s) PETERSEN, JENS	
	Examiner Carlos A. Azpuru	Art Unit 1615	

All Participants:

(1) Carlos A. Azpuru.

(2) Stan Azman
Status of Application: Non Final

(3) Victoria Silcott

(4) PIERRE KARY
Date of Interview: 2/23/2006
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☐ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

Pending rejections were discussed to differentiate the polymers of the references from those of the instant claims.

Claims discussed:
all.
Prior art documents discussed:
RU 1129, EP 1232, GB 1578, Reissue 1913
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

It was agreed that the specific differences between the instant claims & the polymers of each reference would

Part III. be detailed in the response.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

It was also agreed that claim language would state that the polyacrylamide backbone claimed is substantially free of other polymer content unless a ~~best~~ support can be found for the term "predominantly". Method of using claims will also be added. It was agreed that the instant claims appear to be allowable over the prior art.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature - if appropriate)

Reviewing a Supplement Search